The Eponyms of the Assyrian Empire 910-612 B.C. By Alan Millard. State Archives of Assyria Studies, vol. 2. Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1994. Pp. xvi + 155 + 20 pls. \$36.50.

This book provides a text edition of the eponym lists and eponym chronicles for the period from the eponymate of Adad-nirari II (910 B.C.) to that of Ahu-iläya (649 B.C.). For the texts from Nineveh in the British Museum, which constitute the bulk of the material, Millard publishes his own cuneiform copies; for the texts from Assur and Sultantepe, he reproduces older copies by Schroeder and Gurney. Millard presents a full score, arranged year by year, based on all the texts (pp. 23-54) and offers a simplified English adaptation of this material (pp. 55-62). He assembles a very useful catalogue of eponym dates found on other Neo-Assyrian texts, including postcanonical and extracanonical eponyms (pp. 79-125). A short introduction (pp. 1-14) and detailed indexes (pp. 128-53) are also provided. as well as an assessment of current research on the post- and extracanonical eponyms by Robert Whiting (pp. 72-78). This is the first complete edition of the eponym lists and chronicles in more than fifty years and should be welcomed by researchers in the field.

Non-Assyriologists who use the English summary should be aware that this does not always adequately represent the testimony of the eponym texts: it adds extraneous material not contained in the texts themselves (e.g., titles of eponym officials before 857 B.C.), it does not always indicate restorations or emendations, and it takes no note of variants (which sometimes differ substantially from the accepted readings). Readers who wish a more representative view of the text tradition should consult the score. The score itself sometimes presents problems, mostly minor,

in the form of mistransliterations (e.g., zuhina for zu-hi-na [767:B1], is-suh-ra for is-su-uh-ra [707:B4], ana for a-na [811:B1], ahhē2 for ahu2 [681:A1], ši for si [752:A3], kat for kàt [743:B1], el for il [713:B4]) and mistranscriptions (usually in deviating from the norms laid down in the 1978 edition of Borger's Assyrisch-babylonische Zeichenliste, which the editor has set as his standard [p. xvi]; this is particularly true for the various writings of the divine names Marduk and Nergal, which are often given incorrect index numbers [830, 799, 798, 751, 746, 731, and passim], and occasionally extends to common nouns and to verbs such as šemû and amāru [e.g., 799, 737, 724]); less frequent are omissions of signs (e.g., KUR/māt before i-tu-\alpha in 769:B1, also omitted in the copy) or column markers (:) (e.g., 858:B5). Almost all these problems can readily be solved by reference to the cuneiform copies, which are generally more faithful to the original tablets.1

This presentation of basic source material should stimulate further historical research both into the texts themselves and into the Neo-Assyrian dating system, which is still imperfectly understood. It would be helpful, for instance, to investigate further into the reliability of the eponym lists and chronicles, most of which seem to be seventh-century copies. For example, there are obvious discrepancies between the names of eponyms preserved for the reign of Adad-nirari II in the eponym lists and the names preserved in the contemporary annals of the king; there are conflicts between the campaign data for Shalmaneser III in his own inscriptions and the listing of campaigns in the eponym chronicles; and there are variations within the eponym tradition itself, for example, for the officials serving in the years 786-783, where the names differ substantially among the texts. We are still searching for answers to such puzzles as

¹ The copies in general seem to have fewer difficulties, but there are occasional missed traces or distorted proportions in sign forms. For instance, in 719:B4, there is on the tablet a trace of the bottom of the right vertical of ^re-¹ at the beginning of the line (not shown on the copy), and the signs -ta-rab are proportionately broader (in relation to their height) than indicated in the copy (which also omits the rightmost horizontal in the bottom register of the -rab).

how one reconciles the more or less fixed sequence in which officials served as eponyms through much of the ninth and early eighth century and the clay cube inscribed with the name of an eponym official, which has usually been interpreted as favoring selection of the official by lot.2 Why were eponym chronicles composed to cover the reigns of kings from Shalmaneser III to Sennacherib, and why were much longer entries recorded for Sargon and Sennacherib? What do the entries usually interpreted as referring to campaigns (e.g., "to the Sea") signify; why was a short, single entry chosen for most years and what does it mean? Some of these questions, especially those concerning reliability, will have relevance for ancient chronology, since the date given for the solar eclipse in the eponymate of Bur-Sagale, which forms the cornerstone of Neo-Assyrian absolute chronology (and other systems which ultimately depend on it), is mentioned in antiquity only in the eponym chronicles B1 and B2.

Some corrections noted:

- The end of the year-name system of dating p. 1 in Babylonia took place not ca. 1595, but at least two centuries later; the last unequivocal attestation of year names occurred in the reign of Kurigalzu I, with some traces possibly as late as the reign of Burna-Buriaš II.
- p. 7 It is impossible to be sure that Larak and Sarrabānu were the only cities included in the Babylonian Chronicle entry for "704," since that text is damaged immediately before and after these names (and so other geographical names may have been present); the date at the beginning of the chronicle entry there is broken away (it could just as well have been 703, which would be more in line with the chronology of Sennacherib's annals); 704 was in any case not the equivalent of "Bël-ibni 3" (which was 700, the entry for which begins some lines

² See the solution now proposed by I. L. Finkel and J. E. Reade, "Lots of Eponyms," Iraq 57 (1995): 167-72. Note that Yahalu, whose name is on the cube. is the only nonroyal individual known to have served as eponym on three separate occasions.

Similar damage occurs immediately before and after the same geographical names in eponym chronicle B6.

- later in the chronicle and is explicitly so labeled).
- p. 9 (table 1) Shalmaneser V held the eponymate in his fourth, not his second, year.
- The lengths of reign given in the Assyrian p. 13 Kinglist and the eponym lists/chronicles do not agree in every case. Thus, the Kinglist allots twenty-five years to Ashurnasirpal II. while eponym list A7 gives him only twentyfour years. There are also instances where eponym lists omit names (e.g., 852, A6) or insert names (e.g., A3 has two entries rather than one between the eponyms usually associated with 784 and 782), which would also produce conflicting totals.
- p. 17 The entry for 885 is omitted in A2, not A1.
- Text A9 is VA (not VAT) 8249; it is a prism. p. 19 not a tablet.
- In 831, the Great God "came" (rather than p. 57 "went") from Der.
- Marduk-sharru-usur, eponym for 784, was p. 58 probably governor of Kurbail, not Arbela (this is correct in the table on p. 10).

The author and editors deserve our thanks for this comprehensive edition of important texts. The cuneiform copies, the detailed catalogue of eponym attestations in other documents, and the copious indexes significantly enhance the usability of this invaluable volume. It should serve as a standard reference work for some time to come.

J. A. BRINKMAN

The University of Chicago